

1 John L. Cooper (State Bar No. 050324)
jcooper@fbm.com
2 Stephanie Powers Skaff (State Bar No. 183119)
sskaff@fbm.com
3 Eugene Y. Mar (State Bar No. 227071)
emar@fbm.com
4 Farella Braun & Martel LLP
235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 954-4400
6 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480

7 Attorneys for Defendants
8 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LTD., PATRIOT
SCIENTIFIC CORP., AND ALLIACENSE LTD.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ACER, INC., ACER AMERICA
CORPORATION and GATEWAY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC
CORPORATION, and ALLIACENSE
LIMITED,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:08-cv-00877 JR/HRL

**DEFENDANTS' OPENING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**
(Patent L.R. 4-5(a))

[RELATED CASES]

Date: TBD
Time: TBD
Dept: Courtroom 3, 5th Floor
Before: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA,
INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC
CORPORATION, and ALLIACENSE
LIMITED,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:08-cv-00882 JF/HRL

1 BARCO N.V., a Belgian corporation,

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LTD.,
5 PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC CORP.,
6 ALLIACENSE LTD.,

7 Defendants.

Case No. 5:08-cv-05398 JF/HRL

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I. INTRODUCTION	1
2	II. THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY	1
3	A. Background of the Technology of the '336 Patent	2
4	B. Background of the Technology of the '148 Patent	2
5	C. Background of the Technology of the '890 Patent	3
6	D. Background of the Technology of the '749 Patent	3
7	III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
8	IV. CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS	4
9	A. "Push Down Stack" and Related Terms.....	4
10	1. The Patents Disclose a Variety of "Push Down Stacks." (JCCS Row 2) (passim across asserted patents and claims).....	4
11	2. Plaintiffs' attempt to impose limitations on the connection of the ALU and first push down stack excludes preferred embodiments	7
12	a. The Plain Language of the Terms Requires Only That the ALU Be "Connected To" the Stack	7
13	b. The Specification Contemplates That a Stack Can Be Used With Addresses While Maintaining the Speed Benefits of the Invention's Multiple Instruction Fetch.....	7
14	3. Plaintiffs' Construction Of The Related Terms Is Wrong For the Same Reasons	8
15	B. "Multiple Sequential Instructions" and Related Terms	10
16	1. "Multiple Sequential Instructions" (JCCS Row 7)	10
17	2. "Sequence of program instructions" (JCCS Row 30).....	11
18	3. "Instruction register" (JCCS Row 12).....	12
19	4. "Supply the multiple sequential instructions to said central processing unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle" (JCCS Row 5)	12
20	C. "Main CPU" and "Separate DMA CPU"	13
21	1. Main CPU (JCCS Row 11)	13
22	2. Separate DMA CPU (JCCS Row 14)	14
23	D. "Connected to" (JCCS Row 10, '749 patent, passim)	15
24	E. "Ring Oscillator" and Related Terms (JCCS Row 22)	17

1	1. “Ring Oscillator” was Correctly Construed by Judge Ward.....	17
2	2. Judge Ward properly found a limited disclaimer of systems that	
3	directly rely on an external command input control signal or crystal	
4	/ clock to generate a clock signal17	
5	a. “an entire oscillator disposed upon said integrated circuit	
6	substrate” (JCCS Row 19) (‘336 patent, claims 6 and 13)18	
7	b. “an entire ring oscillator variable speed system clock in said	
8	single integrated circuit” (JCCS Row 23) (‘336 patent, claims 1, 11).....18	
9	c. “providing an entire variable speed clock disposed upon	
10	said integrated circuit substrate” (JCCS Row 28) (‘336 patent, claims 10 and 16)18	
11	F. “Operates asynchronously to” and Related Terms (JCCS Row 29)	19
12	V. MEANS PLUS FUNCTION CLAIMS OF THE ‘749 PATENT	21
13	A. “means connected to said bus for fetching instructions” (Row 4) (‘749	
14	patent, claim 1).....21	
15	1. The claimed function requires the fetching means to supply	
16	instructions during the same memory cycle in which it fetches	22
17	2. Claim 1’s Fetching Means Does Not Include Fetch Ahead Circuitry	23
18	B. multiplexing means on said bus between said central processing unit and	
19	said dynamic random access memory, said multiplexing means being	
20	connected and configured to provide multiplexed row addresses, column	
21	addresses and data on said bus from said central processing unit to said	
22	dynamic random access memory and to provide data from said dynamic	
23	random access memory to said central processing unit (Row 6) (‘749	
24	patent, claim 9).....24	
25	VI. MISCELLANEOUS DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS OF THE ‘336 PATENT	25
26	A. “[including a plurality of electronic devices] correspondingly constructed	
27	of the same process technology with corresponding manufacturing	
28	variations” (Row 17) (‘336 patent, claim 1)	26
29	B. “clocking said central processing unit” (JCCS Row 20) (‘336 <i>passim</i>)	27
30	C. “exchanging coupling control signals, addresses and data” (JCCS Row 18)	
31	(‘336 patent, Claims 6 and 10).....28	
32	D. “as a function of parameter variation” (JCCS Row 21) (‘336 patent,	
33	claim 6)	28
34	E. “external clock” (JCCS Row 24) (‘336 patent, claims 10, 13 and 16)	29
35	VII. CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

4	<i>Applied Medical Resources Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 448 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	9, 21
5	<i>Chimie v. PPG Industrial, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6, 16, 20
6	<i>Electro Medical System, S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.</i> , 34 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	11
7	<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration System, Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	4
8	<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Manufacturing, L.P.</i> , 327 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	11
9	<i>Kara Tech., Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	4, 7
10	<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	3
11	<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10
12	<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3, 4, 5, 11
13	<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	11

FEDERAL STATUTES

20 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶6..... 21

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendants Technology Properties Limited (“TPL”) and Patriot Scientific Corp.
 3 (collectively “Defendants”)¹ own the patents in this litigation, which claim novel architectures
 4 and clocking mechanisms critical to the efficient and high-speed performance of today’s
 5 microprocessors. Charles Moore (“Moore”) and Russell Fish (“Fish”) are the co-inventors of
 6 these pioneer patents. Between late 1988 and 1989, Moore and Fish designed a 32-bit
 7 microprocessor, named “ShBoom.”² On August 3, 1989, Moore and Fish filed a comprehensive
 8 microprocessor patent application. Seven patents, including the patents-in-suit, ultimately issued.
 9 In the intervening years, over 80 global electronics firms (including Intel, Sony, HP and others)
 10 have licensed the patents from TPL, and the patents have withstood over fifteen reexaminations.

11 TPL and its affiliated companies specialize in the development, commercialization and
 12 management of intellectual property assets, including the patents-in-suit. On the product
 13 development side, utilizing licensing proceeds, TPL develops microprocessors using the claimed
 14 inventions in general applications such as USB control, and special applications such as hearing
 15 aids. Patriot is the assignee of Fish’s rights in and to the patents-in-suit. Historically, Patriot
 16 developed hybrid RISC-stack technology, which resulted in smaller, lower power, less expensive
 17 system-on-chip designs. Today Patriot markets and enables innovative proprietary technologies.

18 **II. THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY**

19 The four patents-in-suit share the same specification, albeit with slight differences in
 20 pagination. The patent portfolio has been the subject of a combined total of at least 15 ex parte
 21 reexamination proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”). The first

22 ¹ The plaintiffs from all three related actions, Acer Inc., Acer America Corp., and
 23 Gateway, Inc. (collectively “Acer”), HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc. (collectively
 24 “HTC”), and Barco, N.V. (“Barco”) (collectively “Plaintiffs”), coordinated their proposed claim
 25 constructions, as shown in the Joint Claims Construction Statement, filed October 29, 2010
 26 (“JCCS”). Plaintiffs and Defendants agreed on the construction of 33 claim terms, and this brief
 27 addresses the remaining 30 disputed terms across the four patents in suit. All four patents are at
 28 issue in the *Acer v. TPL* and *HTC v. TPL* actions, while only three of the four are at issue in
Barco v. TPL. The Patent Local Rule requiring parties to identify the most significant claim
 terms applies only to the *Barco* action. This brief generally addresses the most significant and
 potentially case dispositive claim terms first and follows with the remaining miscellaneous terms.

² ShBoom operated in a computer language known as “Forth” that was developed by Moore.
 Moore received a presidential award for his accomplishments in developing Forth.

1 ‘336 patent reexamination certificate issued on December 15, 2009; the second reexamination
 2 certificate issued on November 3, 2010. Collectively, the ‘336 patent overcame 607 references
 3 that were raised against it in reexamination. Similarly, the USPTO recently issued a Notice of
 4 Intent to Reissue Certificate for the ‘890 patent over 614 cited references. To date, 382
 5 references have been raised against the ‘148 patent, and 846 references have been raised against
 6 the ‘749 patent; both are still in reexamination.

7 **A. Background of the Technology of the ‘336 Patent**

8 Microprocessors are complex machines, with millions of individual parts whose operation
 9 requires coordination, both internally and with external components, for the chip to function
 10 properly. This coordination is performed by clock signals. U.S. Patent No. 5,809,336 (‘the ‘336
 11 patent’), entitled “High Performance Microprocessor Having Variable Speed System Clock,”
 12 (Declaration of Eugene Mar in Support of Defendants’ Opening Claim Construction Brief (Mar
 13 Dec.), Ex. A) teaches the use of two independent clocks in a microprocessor system – an on-chip
 14 first clock to time the CPU, and a second independent clock to time the input/output (I/O)
 15 interface. This innovation was widely adopted by the industry and became fundamental to the
 16 increased speed and efficiency of modern microprocessors. Decoupling the system clock from
 17 the I/O clock allowed the clocks to run independently (or “asynchronously”), freeing the system
 18 clock, and thus the CPU, to run faster when needed (or more slowly to conserve power). This
 19 decoupling had the added benefit of reducing the sensitivity of the system as whole to
 20 temperature, voltage and manufacturing variations, since the on-chip first clock and the CPU
 21 could vary together in response to such variations, with minimal impact on the I/O interface due
 22 to the second clock domain.

23 **B. Background of the Technology of the ‘148 Patent**

24 U.S. Patent No. 6,598,148 (‘the ‘148 patent’) also entitled “High Performance
 25 Microprocessor Having Variable Speed System Clock,” (Mar Dec., Ex. I) teaches a
 26 microprocessor that combines the on-chip first clock of the ‘336 patent with the use of more than
 27 50% of the surface area of the integrated circuit for memory. This substantial increase in on-chip
 28 memory supports faster microprocessors, and potentially cheaper systems.

1 **C. Background of the Technology of the '890 Patent**

2 U.S. Patent No. 5,330,890 (“the ‘890 patent”), entitled “High Performance, Low Cost
 3 Microprocessor Architecture,” (Mar Dec., Ex. K) teaches a dual stack architecture and the use of
 4 stack pointers that can reference memory in any location to provide more architectural
 5 flexibility and faster access to data elements. Combining this with other features, such as a
 6 memory controller and direct memory access, the ‘890 patent allows the CPU to off-load memory
 7 transfer of data to achieve further efficiencies and higher performance.

8 **D. Background of the Technology of the '749 Patent**

9 Microprocessors operate instructions that are usually stored in a memory that is slower
 10 than the CPU. U.S. Patent No. 5,440,749 (“the ‘749 patent,”), entitled “High Performance, Low
 11 Cost Microprocessor Architecture,”(Mar Dec., Ex. M) teaches a processor that fetches multiple
 12 instructions at a time, and then supplies them to the CPU in parallel (at the same time) in a single
 13 memory cycle. Since memory is generally slower than the CPU, being able to fetch and supply
 14 more than one instruction at a time increases the amount of instructions the CPU can receive in a
 15 given time, and thus increases instruction bandwidth.

16 The ‘749 combines this technology with the last-in first-out data organization also called a
 17 “pushdown stack.” A stack is an efficient way of organizing data in computer memory that uses a
 18 last-in first-out data structure, and an intuitive way of organizing data for a processor to perform
 19 arithmetic functions.

20 **III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**

21 The proper construction of claims is a legal determination. *Markman v. Westview
 22 Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (*en banc*), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). To
 23 ascertain the meaning of terms used in the patent claims, courts first consider a patent’s intrinsic
 24 evidence, which includes the claims themselves, the specification, and the prosecution history.
 25 *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 979; *see also Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1315-17 (Fed. Cir.
 26 2005). Courts may also rely on extrinsic evidence such as dictionary definitions, expert opinion,
 27 and the prior art. *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 980-81. In construing claims, it is “unjust to the public, as
 28 well as an evasion of the law, to construe it in a manner different from the plain import of its

1 terms.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312 (citation omitted). This is because “[i]t is a ‘bedrock
 2 principle’ of patent law that ‘the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is
 3 entitled the right to exclude.’” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312 (*quoting Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v.*
 4 *Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)).

5 The words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning as
 6 understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Although the
 7 specification may describe specific embodiments, the claims are not limited to those
 8 embodiments. *Kara Tech., Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.*, 582 F.3d 1341, 1347-48 (Fed. Cir. 2009).

9 **IV. CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS.**

10 The parties dispute the proper construction of 30 claim terms from the asserted patents. In
 11 nearly every instance, the dispute centers on Plaintiffs’ attempts to import limitations on the claim
 12 that would either limit the claims to a preferred embodiment or exclude a preferred embodiment.
 13 The disputed terms, their proposed constructions, and their support, are specified in the parties’
 14 Patent Local Rule 4-3 filing of the Joint Claims Construction Statement, Exhibits B-D, (Dkt. 203
 15 (Acer)) (“JCCS”).

16 **A. “Push Down Stack” and Related Terms**

17 The parties dispute the proper construction of the term “push down stack” and related
 18 terms concerning how push down stacks connect to arithmetic logic units (“ALU”).

19 1. The Patents Disclose a Variety of “Push Down Stacks.” (JCCS Row 2)
 20 (*passim* across asserted patents and claims)

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
a group of data storage elements organized from top to bottom to provide last-in first-out access to stored items, wherein any previously stored items propagate towards the bottom by one data storage element while a new item is stored in the top data storage element	Data storage elements organized to provide last-in first-out access to items

21 The parties agree that a “push down stack” — also referred to as a “stack” — consists of
 22 data storage elements organized to provide last-in, first-out (“LIFO”) access to items. *See, e.g.*,
 23 ‘890 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. L at TPL-VO004406 (citing extrinsic evidence “stack is
 24

1 sometimes referred to as a last-in-first-out or LIFO data structure"); *see also*, The Computer
 2 Glossary, 651, Mar Dec., Ex. S. This last-in-first-out property is also expressed in terms of
 3 "pushing" and "popping." "The last item, or address, placed (pushed) onto the stack is the first
 4 item removed (popped) from the stack." *Id.* The patent prescribes that:

5 [f]or math and logic operations, the microprocessor 50 exploits the
 6 inherent advantage of a stack by designating the source operand(s)
 7 as the top stack item and the next stack item. The math or logic
 operation is performed, the operands are **popped** from the stack, and
 the result is **pushed** back on the stack. (emphasis added).

8 '890 patent, 24:9-15; Mar Dec., Ex. K.

9 Although the parties agree that a push down stack is a data storage element organized on a
 10 LIFO basis, Plaintiffs attempt to impose extraneous limitations on the structure of push down
 11 stacks, requiring them to have "a group of data storage elements organized from top to bottom,"
 12 and for items to "propagate towards the bottom by one data storage element." These limitations
 13 are not required by the ordinary meaning of the term "stack" and the patents do not depart from or
 14 disclaim the ordinary meaning so as to limit stacks to data storage elements in a top down
 15 relationship. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1316. Plaintiffs' mischief was revealed by their expert Dr.
 16 Wolfe, who testified the patents exclusively disclose a "stack processor" that utilizes "hardware
 17 stacks":

18 Q: When you use the term "stack processor," what do you mean by that
 19 phrase?

20 A: Loosely, it's used to describe processors in which the CPU performs its
 21 operations on a hardware stack structure. It obtains the operands for its
 22 instructions from a hardware stack rather than from general-purpose registers
 23 or special dedicated operand registers.

24 Instead, it stores all of its inputs to operations on a particular structure
 25 called a hardware stack and uses those both to supply the operands for
 26 calculations and to store the results of calculations.

27 ****

28 Q: How do you implement a hardware stack?

29 A: Generally the way you implement a hardware stack is, you have some
 30 storage structure, usually registers and it operates in such a way that when
 31 you add something to the top of the stack, the position of every other piece of
 32 data gets moved down; and when you remove something from the top of the
 33 stack, the position of every other piece of data gets moved up.

1 Wolfe Dep. 26:14-27:10, 29:13-21; Mar Dec., Ex. V. While Plaintiffs would like to limit the
 2 stacks of the specification to “hardware stacks,” and their claim construction is carefully
 3 calibrated to such an arrangement, the patents are not so limiting.

4 The patents disclose a variety of stacks. Yet, none of the embodiments is called a
 5 “hardware stack,” and none discusses how pieces of data are **physically** arranged or **physically**
 6 **propagate** from element-to-element upon a push or a pop. To the contrary, some use general
 7 purpose memory such as RAM to store data items, and in several the microprocessor uses stack
 8 pointers to track the contents of and operate the stacks. Figure 2 discloses a push down stack (74)
 9 connected to top and next item registers (76 and 78), which provide inputs to, and receive output
 10 from, the ALU. ‘890 patent, 6:21-27; Mar Dec., Ex. K. The specification does not state that 74 is
 11 a “hardware stack” or that data items must physically propagate from element to element.
 12 Figures 2 and 13 both show the use of stack pointers to track and operate the stack. Having
 13 pointers “point to” the location of the data storage elements would be unnecessary if the data was
 14 always physically stacked in a single location and propagated from element-to-element. ‘749
 15 patent, 19:35-38; Mar Dec. Ex. M. The return push down stack is also disclosed as using
 16 addressable registers. *Id.*, 31:46-57.

17 Figure 21 drives this point home, showing a novel triple cache stack architecture utilizing
 18 **on-chip** and **off-chip** memory including RAM to store stack elements. *Id.*, 19:6-43. RAM is by
 19 definition “random access memory,” so it has no requirement that data must “propagate” in any
 20 particular way through RAM. The elements of this stack are organized by the microprocessor
 21 using multiple **stack pointers**.³ *Id.*, 19:20-23; 35-38. The disparate on-chip and off-chip memory
 22 locations are not arranged from “top to bottom.”⁴ Plaintiffs’ claim construction would read out
 23 this embodiment, and is therefore improper. *Chimie v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 402 F.3d 1371, 1377
 24 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (reading out a preferred embodiment “would rarely if ever be correct.”).

25
 26 ³ See, The Computer Dictionary (stack pointer: “A register that contains the current address of the
 27 top element of the stack.”); Mar Dec., Ex. T.

28 ⁴ Extrinsic evidence confirms that the ordinary meaning of “stack” is not limited to the type of
 hardware register Plaintiffs’ construction contemplates. See, e.g., The Computer Glossary (“a set
 of hardware registers **or** a reserved amount of main memory . . .”) Mar Dec., Ex. S.

2. Plaintiffs' attempt to impose limitations on the connection of the ALU and first push down stack excludes preferred embodiments.

The parties' competing constructions for claims reciting how a push down stack connects to the ALU are exemplified here:

- “Push down stack connected to said ALU” (JCCS Row 1) (‘749 patent, claims 1 and 9)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>A push down stack comprising a top item register and a next item register, both directly coupled to the ALU such that source and destination addresses are not used</p>	<p>Ordinary meaning unless already defined – “push down stack,” “connected to,” “ALU”</p>

The same dispute occurs in JCCS Rows 3, 8, 9, 15, 16. TPL proposes that claim terms covering how push down stacks (and their top and next registers) are “connected to” the ALU should be construed according to their ordinary meaning except for sub-terms elsewhere construed, such as “push down stack,” “connected to” and “ALU.” Plaintiffs import the narrowing limitation that the stack be “directly coupled to the ALU such that source and destination addresses are not used,” which is incorrect and excludes preferred embodiments.

- a. The Plain Language of the Terms Requires Only That the ALU Be “Connected To” the Stack

The plain language of these claim terms recites that a push down stack is connected to an ALU. Claim terms are typically given their plain and ordinary meaning and here there was no disavowal, so these terms should be given their full scope. *Kara Tech., Inc.*, 582 F.3d at 1347-48. A connection to carry signals is all that is required. See below IV(D) (“connected to”).

b. The Specification Contemplates That a Stack Can Be Used With Addresses While Maintaining the Speed Benefits of the Invention's Multiple Instruction Fetch

One of the points of novelty of the patents, particularly the '749 patent, was to fetch and supply multiple instructions during a single memory cycle. The patents-in-suit managed to "break the Von Neumann bottleneck of speed of getting the next instruction," by disclosing a preferred embodiment able to fetch and supply "4 instructions per memory cycle," ('749 patent, 7:12-18; Mar Dec., Ex. M) over prior art which was capable of fetching and supplying only one

1 instruction at a time. A preferred embodiment teaches instructions of a mere 8 bits, so that over a
 2 32 bit bus, a microprocessor practicing the invention could fetch and supply 4 instructions at
 3 once. One way the patent taught to shorten instructions was to employ a push down stack, which
 4 “allows the use of implied addresses, rather than the prior art technique of explicit addresses for
 5 two sources and a destination.” *Id.* at 7:18-22. Using a stack for math and logic instructions pops
 6 operands from the stack and pushes the result back onto the stack without requiring addresses. *Id.*
 7 at 33:67-34:1.

8 In addition to implied addressing, the patents further disclose that (a) a stack can be
 9 configured as a register file and therefore be made addressable, and (b) instructions that access
 10 stack elements by address can be kept short, thereby preserving the benefits of parallel fetch.

11 The patents clearly and repeatedly teach that a push down stack can be configured as an
 12 addressable register file:

13 The Return Stack 134 is implemented as 16 on-chip RAM locations...The
 14 microprocessor allows these 16 locations to also be used as **addressable**
 15 **registers**. The 16 locations may be read and written by two instructions
 which indicate a Return Stack relative address from 0-15.

16 *Id.*, 31:46-57 (emphasis added). In prosecution the inventors reiterated that a push down stack
 17 may be “configured as a register file,” and that such an organization “conveys the benefits of both
 18 stacks and registers.” ‘749 Pros. Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. N at TPL0001097; *see also*, ‘749 patent,
 19 3:13-15; Mar Dec., Ex. M (“The register file desirably is a second push down stack”). It was well
 20 known that a register file uses addresses. *See id.* 15: 28-30; fig. 13. Accordingly, one of skill in
 21 the art would recognize that under the patents the ALU and push down stack could interact using
 22 addresses to specify the location of the top and next registers that provide inputs to, and receive
 23 outputs from the ALU, and that these registers could be registers from a register file regardless of
 24 whether it is organized from the Return or Parameter stack.

25 3. Plaintiffs’ Construction Of The Related Terms Is Wrong For the Same
 26 Reasons.

27 The related claim terms in dispute similarly recite that the ALU is connected to the push
 28 down stack (with variations in detail):

- “ALU having an output connected to said means for storing a top item” (JCCS Row 3) (‘749 patent, claims 1 and 9)
- “(a) a top item connected to a first input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the top item to the first input and (b) a next item connected to a second input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the next item to the second input” (JCCS Row 9) (‘749 patent, claim 1)
- “an output of said arithmetic logic unit being connected to said top item register” (JCCS Row 16) (‘890 patent, claim 1)
- “push down stack with a top item register and a next item register, connected to provide inputs to the arithmetic logic unit” (JCCS Row 15) (‘890 patent, claim 1)

Plaintiffs' proposal to import "directly coupled ... such that source and destination addresses are not used" fails for each of these terms for the reasons stated above.

This same issue arises in connection with means-plus-function claim elements⁵ that describe the connection of the ALU to the top and next registers of the stack:

- (a) "means for storing a top item connected to a first input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the top item to the first input" and
- (b) "means for storing a next item connected to a second input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the next item to the second input"

These elements are found in '749 Patent, claims 1 and 9 (JCCS Row 8).

The parties' propose the following constructions:

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>(a) Function: storing a top item connected to a first input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the top item to the first input</p> <p>Structure: Top item register 76 of stack 74 directly coupled to a first input of ALU 80 through line 82 such that source and destination addresses are not used.</p>	<p>Function: <i>Ordinary meaning, unless defined elsewhere, including “arithmetic logic unit” and “connected to”</i></p> <p>Structure: <i>register or its equivalents</i></p>
<p>(b) Function: storing a next item connected to a second input of said arithmetic logic unit to provide the next item to the second input</p> <p>Structure: Next item register 78 of stack 74 directly coupled to a first input of</p>	

⁵ In construing a means-plus-function claim, the court must first determine the claimed function and then identify the corresponding structure that performs that function. *Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 448 F.3d 1324, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

1	ALU 80 through line 84 such that source and destination addresses are not used.	
---	--	--

3 Plaintiffs' proposed function quotes the claim language, so the parties are essentially in
4 agreement that the claimed function should be understood as its ordinary meaning. TPL adds that
5 sub-terms elsewhere construed should be incorporated into the construction, which should be
6 uncontroversial. The disagreement again is whether the corresponding structure should be limited
7 to elements "directly coupled...such that source and destination addresses" may not be used. As
8 explained above, Plaintiffs' extraneous limitations on the operation of stacks are improper.

9 TPL properly construes the corresponding structure as a "register or its equivalents."

10 Figure 2 discloses a top item register 76 and a next item register 78, '749 patent, 6:28-35; 19:6-8;
11 Mar Dec., Ex. M (ALU connected to register 76 "by line"). Case law permits a patent owner to
12 prove infringement by pointing to the disclosed structure or its *equivalents*. *McGinley v.*
13 *Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F. 3d 1339, 46-48 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Indeed, Figure 21 discloses one
14 such alternative, on-chip latches,⁶ as a substitute for the registers. Accordingly, alternatives to
15 registers such as latches are not only permissible as a matter of law but also expressly disclosed,
16 and TPL's construction is correct.

17 **B. "Multiple Sequential Instructions" and Related Terms**

18 1. "Multiple Sequential Instructions" (JCCS Row 7)

19 The broad claim term "multiple sequential instructions" is found in both Claims 1 and 9⁷
20 of the '749 Patent, and its construction is closely related to three other claim terms.

21 Plaintiffs' Construction	21 TPL's Construction
22 Two or more instructions in sequence, in which any operand that is present must be right-justified in the instruction register	22 Two or more instructions in <i>a program</i> sequence

24 TPL's proposed construction of this term is very similar to the first half of Plaintiffs'
25 proposed construction, but Plaintiffs add the limitation "in which any operand that is present must

26 _____
27 ⁶ These are "the fastest form of memory device built on the chip, delivering data in as little as 3
n[ano]s[econds]." *Id.* at 19:13-15.

28 ⁷ The '749 patent has been in reexamination since March 2008, and Claims 1 and 9 are currently
pending in that reexamination.

1 be right-justified in the instruction register.” JCSS Row 7. Defendants’ construction follows the
 2 guidance of *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 at 1312, where the words used in a claim are
 3 generally given their ordinary and customary meaning. Here, “multiple” means “two or more,”
 4 and “sequential instructions” means “instructions in a program sequence.” Plaintiffs’ proposal
 5 goes beyond the claimed sequential instructions in an attempt to sweep in instruction registers
 6 themselves, and operands within those registers. This is wrong.

7 Plaintiffs erroneously seek to limit the claim to variable width operands, but variable
 8 width operands are only a preferred embodiment in the specification, and should not be read into
 9 the claims when the claim language is broader than the embodiments, as is the case here. *See*
 10 *Electro Med. Sys., S.A. v. Cooper Life Sci., Inc.*, 34 F.3d 1048, 1054 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Although
 11 variable width operands must be right-justified in the instruction register (*see* ‘749 patent, 18:33-
 12 45; Mar Decl., Ex. M), not all operands in the ‘749 patent are variable width, nor must they all be
 13 right-justified in the instruction register. As but one example, the specification describes 8 bit
 14 instructions that consist of a 4-bit opcode and a 4-bit operand. *Id.*, 31:35-32:16. Such 8-bit
 15 instructions can be located anywhere in the instruction register, and thus the corresponding
 16 operand is not necessarily right-justified in the instruction register. Because Plaintiffs’
 17 construction would read out these preferred embodiments, it should be rejected.⁸

18 2. “Sequence of program instructions” (JCCS Row 30)

19 This claim term is found in Claim 4 of the ‘148 patent. Defendants propose it be
 20 construed simply as “one or more instructions in a program sequence.” Plaintiffs once again seek
 21

22 ⁸ The prosecution history contains a 10/25/94 Examiner Interview Summary, where the
 23 examiner’s handwritten notes say “Claim 1: Opera. Width is variable & right adjusted.” Mar
 24 Decl., Ex. O at TPL0001136. In the Response to Office Action leading up to that interview, the
 25 applicants were overcoming the Boufarah prior art reference. In the amendment filed
 26 immediately after the interview, the applicants acknowledged a possible amendment to add
 27 variable width operands to overcome Boufarah, but never entered that claim language. ‘749 Pros.
 28 Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. W at TPL0001169-1171. It is a “bedrock principle” that “the claims of a
 patent define the invention” and “we look to the words of the claims themselves.” *Vitronics Corp.*
v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed.Cir.1996). An unadopted amendment accordingly
 cannot limit the claims. Similarly, the unadopted amendment “does not show any clear and
 unambiguous disavowal” of claim scope. *Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.*, 327 F.3d 1364,
 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

1 to import the restriction “in which any operand that is present must be right-justified in the
 2 instruction register. *See* JCCS Row 30. Without that improper limitation, as discussed above,
 3 Plaintiffs’ proposed construction is “two or more instructions in sequence.” Since a sequence of
 4 instructions can be one or more, the Court should adopt Defendants’ proposed construction.

5 3. “Instruction register” (JCCS Row 12)

6 This term is found in Claim 1 of the ‘890 patent. The parties agree on the construction
 7 “register that receives and holds one or more instructions for supplying to circuits that interpret
 8 the instruction,” JCCS Row 12, but Plaintiffs seek to import the same restriction as noted above.
 9 For the reasons previously discussed, the Court should adopt Defendants’ construction.

10 4. “Supply the multiple sequential instructions to said central processing unit
 11 integrated circuit during a single memory cycle” (JCCS Row 5)

12 This term is found in Claim 1 of the ‘749 patent. Plaintiffs’ proposed construction differs
 13 from Defendants’ in that Plaintiffs seek to add limitations indicated by the bolded language:

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
Provide the multiple sequential instructions in parallel (as opposed to one-by-one) to said central processing unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle without using a prefetch buffer or a one-instruction-wide instruction buffer that supplies one instruction at a time	Provide the multiple sequential instructions in parallel to said central processing unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle

19 Once again, Plaintiffs improperly narrow the claim by importing limitations into the plain
 20 language of the claim. Indeed, the specification does not *exclude* systems that contain a prefetch
 21 buffer, and none of Plaintiffs’ intrinsic evidence cited in the JCCS suggests that it does. Rather,
 22 the patent teaches the feature of being able to fetch and supply multiple instructions in parallel in
 23 a single cycle without *using* an intervening prefetch buffer.

24 This is supported by the prosecution history. The inventors overcame a rejection for
 25 anticipation by the Transputer references, Edwards and May. While the Transputer references
 26 disclosed fetching instructions into a prefetch buffer, the instructions were not supplied to the
 27 instruction register until a second memory cycle, thus distinguishing them from the ‘749 patent.

28 The inventors traversed the rejection by noting that “[f]etching multiple instructions into a

1 prefetch buffer and then supplying them one at a time is not sufficient to meet the claim limitation
 2 -- the supplying of ‘multiple sequential instructions to a CPU during a single memory cycle.’”
 3 ‘749 Reexam Hist.; Mar Decl., Ex. Q at TPL0554266. That does not mean that using a prefetch
 4 buffer to fetch multiple instructions is not within the claim; the key is to have the instructions
 5 supplied in a single memory cycle. While Edwards (May) disclosed a memory controller that
 6 fetched multiple instructions, it supplied them only one at a time, and therefore did not meet the
 7 claim.⁹ Plaintiffs’ attempt to narrow the claim fails, and the Court should adopt Defendants’
 8 constructions.

9 **C. “Main CPU” and “Separate DMA CPU”**

10 Main CPU, and the related claim term, “separate DMA CPU,” are found in Claim 1 of the
 11 ‘890 patent, and should be construed consistently.

12 1. Main CPU (JCCS Row 11)

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
Main CPU that does not perform direct memory access related operations	<i>A main electronic circuit on an integrated circuit that controls the interpretation and execution of programmed instructions</i>

13 Defendants propose the ordinary meaning of “Main CPU,” and this construction has the
 14 benefit of being nearly identical to Judge Ward’s Order construing CPU as found in the ‘336
 15 patent in the Texas litigation¹⁰ (*see* Mem. Op. and Order, June 15, 2007, 9 (“Ward Order”; Mar
 16 Decl., Ex. A) (“an electronic circuit on an integrated circuit that controls the interpretation and
 17 execution of programmed instructions”).

18 The construction is also supported by the specification, dictionary definitions, and
 19 prosecution history. In the March 27, 2009 Response to the Office Action in the reexamination of
 20

21
 22
 23
 24
 25 ⁹ May discloses parallel register banks, but because it has only one instruction buffer which holds
 26 only one instruction, all instructions must pass through that single buffer, and only one instruction
 27 at a time is supplied to the CPU. ’749 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. R at TPL-VO007138.

28 ¹⁰ TPL previously litigated infringement of the ‘336 and ‘148 patents, which are at issue in this
 29 case, in *TPL v. Fujitsu Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 2:05-CV-00494 (E.D. Tex.). Judge Ward’s Order in
 30 the Texas litigation construed several claim terms that are identical or related to the claim terms
 31 in dispute in this case.

1 the ‘148 patent, Applicants pointed out that “[t]he processing unit operating in accordance with a
2 predefined sequence of program instructions requires a device configured to execute the program
3 instructions. . . . [T]he specification shows that the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent
4 with the specification of the recited processing unit is a device configured to execute the
5 predefined sequence of program instructions. Col. 4, ll. 1-3” (further citations omitted). Mar
6 Decl., Ex. J at TPL0545737-38. *See also*, Computer Dictionary (1991)(CPU is “the device that
7 interprets and executes instructions”); American Heritage Dictionary (1985)(CPU is “[t]he part of
8 a computer that interprets and executes instructions.”) Mar Decl., Exs. T and U.

9 Plaintiffs attempt to narrow the ordinary meaning of CPU by limiting it to “not
10 performing direct memory access related operations,” but Plaintiffs are wrong, as their expert
11 Dr. Wolfe testified that the main CPU can initiate memory transfers.¹¹ As this falls within the
12 realm of “direct memory access related operations,” even Plaintiffs’ expert appears to disagree
13 with Plaintiffs’ proposal. The Court should adopt TPL’s construction.

2. Separate DMA CPU (JCCS Row 14)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
a separate CPU that fetches and executes instructions for performing direct memory access without using the main CPU	<i>Electrical circuit for reading and writing to memory that is separate from a main CPU</i>

Claim 1 of the '890 patent claims:

A microprocessor, which comprises a main central processing unit and a *separate direct memory access central processing unit* in a single integrated circuit comprising said microprocessor, said *direct memory access central processing unit* providing inputs to said memory controller

22 ‘890 patent, 32:44-47, 64-65; Mar Dec., Ex. K (emphasis added). Plaintiffs do not offer a
23 definition of the claimed terms. Instead they restate the term with additional limitations that are
24 not supported by the specification, in this case excluding the element “direct memory access”
25 (“DMA”) from use of the main CPU. Yet the claim language includes no such prohibition, nor is
26 there support for that limitation in the specification. In contrast, Defendants’ construction is

¹¹ (Q. [Can the main CPU in the '890 patent] [i]nitiate a transfer or request for data from memory? A. Well, it certainly can request a single element of data from memory, that's one of its capabilities, yeah.") Wolfe Dep. 167:19-168:10; Mar Dec., Ex. V.

1 correct because it describes the “DMA CPU” as properly distinct (“separate”) from the main
 2 CPU, in keeping with the claim structure, and defines the DMA CPU in accordance with the
 3 specification, as an “electrical circuit for reading and writing to memory.”

4 The specification includes at least two preferred embodiments of the DMA CPU. The
 5 first is shown in Figure 2, where the microprocessor, 50, has a separate DMA CPU, 72, with “the
 6 ability to fetch and execute instructions.” ‘749 patent, 8:22-23; Mar Dec., Ex. M. “[A] second
 7 embodiment of a microprocessor in accordance with the invention,” shown in Figure 9, discloses
 8 a DRAM die with on-chip memory and a “DMA CPU” 314. *Id.*, 4:61-62. Here, “the DMA
 9 processor 72 of the microprocessor 50 has been replaced with a ***more traditional*** DMA
 10 controller.” *Id.*, 12:63-65 (emphasis added). This “more traditional DMA controller” is one that
 11 functions more as a traditional state machine, without the ability to fetch its own instructions that
 12 characterizes a CPU. *See, e.g., id.*, 1:55-58, Background of the Invention (DMA controllers in
 13 conventional microprocessors “can provide routine handling of DMA requests and responses, but
 14 some processing by the main central processing unit (CPU) of the microprocessor is required.”).
 15 As the specification discloses at least two embodiments of a DMA CPU and Plaintiffs’
 16 construction would exclude the “traditional” “DMA CPU 314” of Figure 9, it is incorrect.

17 **D. “Connected to” (JCCS Row 10, ‘749 patent, *passim*)**


18 TPL construes “connected to” as “connected to convey signals to.” Plaintiffs construe this
 19 term to include a “directly coupled” limitation for some terms and leave the door open for other
 20 undisclosed constructions of this term depending on how various components interact elsewhere:

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
In 6.1 and 27.1, [sic] “connected to” means “directly coupled . . . such that source and destination addresses are not used;” in other contexts, the meaning of “connected to” depends upon how the connected components are supposed to interact.	<i>Connected to convey signals to</i>

26 TPL’s construction is correct and supported by the specification. Plaintiffs’ attempt to substitute
 27 the term “directly coupled” for “connected to” in various claim terms is misplaced because
 28 throughout the specification, two components can be connected to convey signals without being

1 directly connected.¹²

2 Figure 3 illustrates that components on an integrated circuit can be considered connected
3 despite intervening circuit elements.



10 In this embodiment, “row address strobe 54 is *connected through row address strobe decode logic 154 to* the row address strobe input of the DRAM by lines 156 and 158.” ‘749 patent, 7:40-
11 43; Mar Dec., Ex. M. As the two circled elements here are “connected” through another logic
12 element (154) the term “connected to” as used in the specification permits for the presence of
13 intervening structures.¹³ If “connected to” required “direct coupling” or required a connection
14 “without any intervening structure” then the claims would not read on this preferred embodiment.
15 Such constructions are rarely, if ever, correct.¹⁴ See *Chimie*, 402 F.3d at 1377.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ¹² Plaintiffs’ construction attempts to again import the erroneous limitations prohibiting the use of
24 source and destination addresses. This is discussed above in construction of Push Down Stacks.
25 See Section IV (A2).

26 ¹³ Plaintiffs’ expert, Dr. Wolfe, concedes that connected items could have at least buffers and
27 switches in their path, wholly undercutting Plaintiffs cramped construction. Wolfe Dep. 79:25-
28 80:7; Mar Dec. Ex., V (“Certainly, having a **buffer** along the way to repower the signal, I think
I don’t think it’s that limiting” (emphasis added).

¹⁴ Plaintiffs’ construction is also improper and wholly unworkable because it varies in an
undisclosed manner “depend[ing] upon how the connected components are supposed to interact.”
JCCS Row 10.

1 **E. “Ring Oscillator” and Related Terms (JCCS Row 22)**

2 1. “Ring Oscillator” was Correctly Construed by Judge Ward

3 Plaintiffs’ Construction	4 TPL’s Construction
5 An oscillator having a multiple, odd 6 number of inversions arranged in a loop, wherein the oscillator is: (1) non- controllable; and (2) variable based on the environment	6 An oscillator having a multiple, odd number of inversions arranged in a loop

7 “Ring oscillator” is found in claims 1, 11, and 15 of the ‘336 patent, in claim 7 of the ‘890
8 patent, and in claims 4 and 11 of the ‘148 patent. The parties agree that a ring oscillator is “[a]n
9 oscillator having a multiple, odd number of inversions arranged in a loop...” This was Judge
10 Ward’s claim construction and accords with the full and ordinary meaning of the term. Plaintiffs
11 propose additional limitations, including that the oscillator be (1) non-controllable, and
12 (2) variable based on the environment, but they are wrong.

13 The specifications set forth that ring oscillators are controllable, at a minimum, by
14 temperature and voltage. ‘336 patent, 16:59-60; Mar Dec., Ex. B (“The ring oscillator frequency
15 is determined by the parameters of temperature, voltage and process”).

16 Plaintiffs’ additional proposed limitation of “variable based on the environment” is
17 ambiguous since “the environment” is not clearly defined. According to the ‘336 specification,
18 “the ring oscillator frequency is determined by the parameters of temperature, voltage, and
19 process.” *Id.*, 16:59-60. This is the only “environment” that is disclosed in the specification.¹⁵

20 2. Judge Ward properly found a limited disclaimer of systems that *directly*
21 rely on an external **command input** control signal or crystal / clock to
 generate a clock signal.

22 In the remaining three terms relating to ring oscillators, Plaintiffs have not only tacked on
23 improper limitations to the ring oscillator, as described above, but they also do not acknowledge
24 that the patents exclude only those clocks that *directly rely* on an external clock or **command**
25 **input** control signal **to generate** a clock signal. The three terms, and the parties’ proposed
26 constructions, are as follows:

27 ¹⁵ The same arguments apply to the claim term “ring oscillator variable speed system clock
28 connected to said main central processing unit” (JCCS Row 13 ‘890 patent, claim 7), where the
 parties agree on the term’s construction but for the addition of Plaintiffs’ improper limitations.

a. "an entire oscillator disposed upon said integrated circuit substrate" (JCCS Row 19) ('336 patent, claims 6 and 13)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>An oscillator that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not rely on a control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal, wherein the oscillator is: (1) non-controllable; and (2) variable based on the environment</p>	<p>An oscillator that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not <i>directly</i> rely on a command input control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal</p>

b. "an entire ring oscillator variable speed system clock in said single integrated circuit" (JCCS Row 23) ('336 patent, claims 1, 11)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>A ring oscillator variable speed system clock that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not rely on a control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal, wherein the ring oscillator variable speed system clock is: (1) non-controllable; and (2) variable based on the environment</p>	<p>A ring oscillator variable speed system clock that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not <i>directly</i> rely on a command input control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal</p>

- c. “providing an entire variable speed clock disposed upon said integrated circuit substrate” (JCCS Row 28) (‘336 patent, claims 10 and 16)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>providing a variable speed system clock that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not rely on a control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal, wherein the ring oscillator variable speed system clock is: (1) non-controllable; and (2) variable based on the environment</p>	<p>providing a variable speed system clock that is located entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not <i>directly</i> rely on a command input control signal or an external crystal/clock generator to generate a clock signal</p>

TPL's construction comes directly from Judge Ward's claim construction of "an entire ring oscillator variable speed system clock in said integrated circuit." Ward Order, 11-12; Mar Dec. Ex. A. Judge Ward determined that the prior art the patent owner overcame to gain allowance disclosed direct reliance on an external crystal clock signal or command input to generate a clock signal. *See* '336 Pros. Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. C at TPL0001905 (invention

1 “contemplates providing a ring oscillator clock and microprocessor within the same integrated
 2 circuit” rather than prior art’s “provision of frequency control information to an external clock.”);
 3 ‘336 Pros. Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. D at TPL0001920 (arguing “[i]n Sheets [prior art], a command
 4 input is required to change the clock speed.”); ‘336 Pros. Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. E at TPL0001931
 5 (Magar prior art uses a “conventional crystal clock.”). Judge Ward construed the disclaimer in
 6 light of these references to mean “a ring oscillator variable speed system clock that is located
 7 entirely on the same semiconductor substrate as the CPU and does not *directly rely* on a
 8 ***command input control signal*** or an ***external crystal/clock generator*** to generate a clock signal.”
 9 Ward Order, 12; Mar Dec. Ex. A (emphasis added). Notably Judge Ward declined the
 10 Defendants’ invitation to exclude any use of an external clock as a reference signal. Critically,
 11 Plaintiffs’ ignore the fact the prior art cited by Judge Ward lacked the on-chip oscillator feature of
 12 the ‘336 patent. Plaintiffs’ attempt to broaden the disclaimer by modifying Judge Ward’s
 13 construction should be rejected.

14 **F. “Operates asynchronously to” and Related Terms (JCCS Row 29)**

15 The claim term is found in claims 11, 13 and 16 of the ‘336 patent, and the parties’
 16 competing constructions are as follows:

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
operates without a timing relationship to/with	<i>timed by independent clock signals</i>

20 The ‘336 patent and its “dual clock” innovation support TPL’s construction. The
 21 specification section entitled “ASYNCHRONOUS / SYNCHRONOUS CPU” describes “a dual
 22 clock scheme as shown in FIG. 17, with the CPU 70 operating asynchronously to I/O interface.”
 23 ‘336 Reexam Cert., 1:21-23; Mar Dec., Ex H. The basis of the asynchronous operation of the
 24 CPU and I/O interface is that the two devices are timed by two independent clock signals. Figure
 25 17 shows two independent clocks timing the CPU and I/O interface, and claim 11 recites:

26 an entire ring oscillator variable speed system clock ... connected to said
 27 [CPU] . . . and a second clock ***independent*** of said ring oscillator variable
 28 speed system clock connected to said input/output interface, wherein said
 central processing unit ***operates asynchronously to*** said input/output
 interface.

1 ‘336 Reexam Cert., 3:8-11, 22-26; Mar Dec., Ex. H. The specification further discloses “a ring
 2 counter variable speed system clock connected to the central processing unit” and a “second clock
 3 *independent* of the ring counter variable speed system clock [] connected to the input/output
 4 interface.” ‘336 patent, 3:27-28, 23-24; Mar Dec., Ex. B.

5 The applicants introduced “asynchronously” during prosecution “in order to clarify the
 6 meaning of ‘independent’ as recited in the claims.” ‘336 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec. Ex. G at
 7 TPL0549470-71. They cited a treatise to the USPTO that explained, “[a]n asynchronous system
 8 is one containing two or more independent clock signals.” ‘336 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec. Ex. F at
 9 TPL0553776. The applicants further argued “that an asynchronous system is effectively a
 10 collection of *independent* synchronous systems...” *Id.* Plaintiffs’ expert Dr. Wolfe agreed that
 11 asynchronous and independent “mean[] pretty much the same thing.” Wolfe Dep., 134:8-11; Mar
 12 Dec. Ex. V. In light of this evidence, “timed by independent clock signals” properly captures the
 13 meaning of “operates asynchronously to” in the claims of the ‘336 patent.¹⁶

14 For the remaining related terms, the parties dispute whether the second clock signal and
 15 the ring oscillator are “initially generated” or merely “generated” by a different source:

16

- 17 • “a clock signal of said second clock originates from a source other than said ring oscillator
 18 variable speed system clock” (JCCS Row 25) (‘336 patent, claim 1)

19 Plaintiffs’ Construction	20 TPL’s Construction
21 a clock signal of said second clock is initially generated by a different source than said ring oscillator variable speed system clock	a clock signal of said second clock is generated by a different source than said ring oscillator variable speed system clock

22

- 23 • “a clock signal from said off-chip external clock originates from a source other than said
 24 oscillator” (JCCS Row 26) (‘336 patent, claim 6)

25 Plaintiffs’ Construction	26 TPL’s Construction
27 a clock signal from said off-chip external 28 clock is initially generated by a different source than said oscillator	a clock signal of said off-chip external clock is generated by a different source than said oscillator

29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 141

- “a clock signal from said off-chip external clock originates from a source other than said variable speed clock” (JCCS Row 27) ('336 patent, claim 10)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
a clock signal from said off-chip external clock is initially generated by a different source than said variable speed clock	a clock signal of said off-chip external clock is generated by a different source than said variable speed clock

TPL’s proposed construction, requiring the second clock, external clock, and off-chip clock to be “generated” by a different source than the variable speed clock, accords with the patent’s premise that the ring oscillator clock and second clock be “independent.” Judge Ward construed “system clock” and “variable speed clock” as “a circuit that **generates** the signal(s) used for timing the operation of the CPU.” Ward Order, 13; Mar Dec., Ex. A. Plaintiffs agreed to this construction. JCCS Ex. A, Row 27. It follows then that the clock signal for the second clock, which the patent teaches is “independent,” should be “**generated** by a different source than said variable speed clock,” as TPL proposes (and as multiple reexaminations of the ‘336 patent have confirmed). Plaintiffs’ phrase “initially generated” comes out of nowhere, and has no support in the intrinsic evidence. In contrast, TPL’s construction properly tracks Judge Ward’s order, the lessons of the multiple reexaminations, captures the independence of the two clocks, and is supported by the specification.

V. MEANS PLUS FUNCTION CLAIMS OF THE '749 PATENT

The ‘749 patent contains several means plus function claims, reading on the multiple instruction fetch, multiplexing and push down stack optimization features of the invention. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶6 of the Patent Act permits claiming in a “means plus function” form; in construing a means-plus-function claim, the court must first determine the claimed function and then identify the corresponding structure that performs that function. *Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 448 F.3d 1324, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

A. "means connected to said bus for fetching instructions" (Row 4) ('749 patent, claim 1)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
Function: fetching instructions for said central processing unit integrated circuit on said bus from said memory, being	Function: fetching instructions for said central processing unit integrated circuit on said bus from said memory, being

1	configured and connected to fetch multiple sequential instructions from said memory in parallel and supply the multiple sequential instructions to said central processing unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle	configured and connected to fetch multiple sequential instructions from said memory in parallel and supply the multiple sequential instructions to said central processing unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle, <i>wherein the fetched “multiple sequential instructions” are supplied to the instruction register 108 during the same memory cycle they are fetched.</i>
2	Corresponding §112 ¶6 structure (Fig. 4):	Corresponding §112 ¶6 structure: Memory controller (118) Instruction register (108) Internal data bus (90) Program counter (130) Internal address bus (136)

13 1. The claimed function requires the fetching means to supply instructions
14 during the same memory cycle in which it fetches.

15 Both parties propose the function defined literally in the claim, which reads:

16 means connected to said bus for **fetching instructions for said central**
17 **processing unit integrated circuit on said bus from said memory**, said
18 means for fetching instructions **being configured and connected to fetch**
multiple sequential instructions from said memory in parallel and
supply the multiple sequential instructions to said central processing
unit integrated circuit during a single memory cycle,¹⁷

19 Claim 1, ‘749 patent, 35:14-26; Mar Dec., Ex. M (emphasis added). TPL clarifies the “in
20 parallel” and “single memory cycle” aspects of the fetching and supplying function by including
21 the language “wherein the fetched ‘multiple sequential instructions’ are supplied to the instruction
22 register 108 during the same memory cycle they are fetched.”

23 This multiple instruction fetch and supply feature of the ‘749 patent was one of its
24 “architectural innovations.” *Id.*, 26:16-29. This provided many advantages including “increased

26 ¹⁷ Claim 9 contains a similar but slightly different means plus function element: “means
27 connected to said bus for fetching instructions for said central processing unit on said bus from
28 said dynamic random access memory, said means for fetching instructions being configured to
 fetch multiple sequential instructions from said dynamic random access memory in parallel and
 supply the multiple instructions to said central processing unit during a single memory cycle.”
‘749 patent at 37:15-22; Mar Dec., Ex. M.

1 execution speed even with slow memories,” and “opportunities to optimize groups of
 2 instructions.” *Id.* This feature overcame “the bottleneck” in most computer systems,” as “[t]he
 3 ability to fetch four instructions in a single memory bus cycle significantly increases the bus
 4 availability to handle data.” *Id.*, 5:54-58.

5 TPL’s proposed function emphasizes that the parallel fetch brings the instructions from
 6 memory to the instruction registers of the CPU in the requisite single memory cycle.

7 By the time the current set of instructions has completed execution, the next
 8 set of instructions is ready for loading into the instruction register.

9 *Id.*, 8:13-16. This passage shows that the fetching operation fetches instructions for “loading into
 10 the instruction register.” *Id.*, 8:10-16.

11 This is consistent with TPL’s arguments to the USPTO in distinguishing the May prior art:
 12 Thus, [May has] no mechanism to supply instructions to either O REG 57, let
 13 alone means for fetching configured to supply multiple sequential
 14 instructions to a central processing unit integrated circuit during a single
 memory cycle as recited in claim 1.

15 ‘749 Reexam Hist.; Mar Decl., Ex. P at TPL0554872.¹⁸ Plaintiffs’ expert agreed with this point.
 16 Wolfe Dep. 147:13-14, 147:23-148:4; Mar Dec. Ex. V (“[claim 1] says to fetch and supply during
 17 a single memory cycle....But my recollection is that it is supplied to the instruction register and
 18 also to a selection multiplexer [sic] beyond the -- beyond the instruction register, and also to a
 19 detection circuit that determines whether or not the multiple sequential instructions can be fetched
 20 in a single cycle.”)

21 2. Claim 1’s Fetching Means Does Not Include Fetch Ahead Circuitry.

22 The parties agree that memory controller (118), instruction register (108), internal data
 23 bus (90), program counter (130) and internal address bus (136) all perform the claimed function
 24 of fetching instructions from the memory to the CPU on the bus. Plaintiffs also seek to include
 25 structures 192, 194 and 196, but this expanded structure should be rejected because the identified
 26 components do not fetch. Structures 192, 194 and 196 merely determine by decoding whether

27
 28 ¹⁸ The patent owner made similar arguments in the ‘749 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec. Ex. Q at
 TPL0554266.

1 certain conditions are met, and if so a fetch is requested ahead of instruction execution, otherwise
 2 a fetch is requested once all instructions in the instruction register have executed. “The output of
 3 decoder 192 on line 196 **requests** an instruction **fetch ahead** by memory controller 118 without
 4 interference with other accesses.” ‘749 patent; 8:7-9; Mar Dec., Ex. M (emphasis added). Thus,
 5 the fetch itself is only performed by memory controller 118:

6 While the current instructions in instruction register 108 are executing, the
 7 **memory controller 118 obtains the address of the next set of four
 instructions from program counter 130 and obtains that set of instructions.**

8 *Id.*, 8:10-13 (emphasis added). Figure 4 shows the internal data bus 90 and internal address bus
 9 136 that interconnect the memory controller 118, instruction register 108 and program counter
 10 130. These components are properly construed as the corresponding structure for the fetching
 11 means.

12 **B. multiplexing means on said bus between said central processing unit and said
 13 dynamic random access memory, said multiplexing means being connected
 14 and configured to provide multiplexed row addresses, column addresses and
 15 data on said bus from said central processing unit to said dynamic random
 access memory and to provide data from said dynamic random access
 memory to said central processing unit (Row 6) (‘749 patent, claim 9)**

16 Claim 9 sets forth the function of the “multiplexing means” as providing “multiplexed row
 17 addresses, column addresses and data...,” (*id.*, 37:8-10) and thus requires a common
 18 understanding of “multiplexing.” TPL’s proposed construction adds the requisite definition to
 19 “multiplexing,” construing the function of the multiplexing means as “providing data, column
 20 addresses, row addresses to a bus, wherein row addresses and column addresses and data **can be
 21 provided to the bus at different times**,” as shown below:

Plaintiffs’ Construction	Defendants’ Construction
Function: being connected and configured to provide multiplexed row addresses, column addresses and data on said bus from said central processing unit to said dynamic random access memory and to provide data from said dynamic random access memory to said central processing unit	Function: providing data, column addresses, row addresses to a bus, wherein row addresses and column addresses and data can be provided to the bus at different times .
Corresponding §112 ¶6 structure (Fig. 12):	Corresponding §112 ¶6 Structure: MUX

1	(1) MUX 378 connected to MUX 382 through MUXED ADDRESS BUS 380;	(382); MUX (378); and MUX in Fig. 12 between 382 and 378
2	(2) MUX 378 connected to the unnumbered MUX between MUX 378 and MUX 382 via the two unnumbered MUXED ADDRESS BUSES (labeled “A23 – A13” and “A12 – A2,” respectively) between MUX 378 and such unnumbered MUX	
3	(3) MUX 382 connected to the unnumbered MUX between MUX 378 and MUX 382 via the two unnumbered MUXED ADDRESS BUSES (labeled “A23 – A13” and “A12 – A2,” respectively) between MUX 382 and such unnumbered MUX	

10 Plaintiffs' construction adds nothing, because it does not define multiplexing, but instead
11 only reuses the claim language in the proposed function. Because the definition of multiplexing
12 is key to the construction of this term, it should not be ignored. Multiplexing refers to the process
13 by which row addresses, column addresses, and data are moved from the CPU to the external
14 memory. The specification discloses in the timing diagram of Figure 11 that different types of
15 information can be placed onto a bus at different times.

16 Figure 11 shows a DRAM implementation, where the bus transmits row addresses starting
17 at time (10), followed by column addresses at time (11), and finally data, at time (12). Thus
18 Figure 11 demonstrates that multiplexing is a very broad claim term that reaches the capability of
19 transmitting row addresses, column addresses, and data at different times. The preferred
20 embodiment shows the transfer of different types of information at the same time, however, this
21 exact order is not essential for multiplexing. '749 patent, 5:3-4; Mar Dec., Ex. M. TPL
22 confirmed this feature of multiplexing during prosecution. *See* '749 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec. Ex.
23 Q at TPL0554297-298.

24 Finally, Plaintiffs' identified structure is overly inclusive, as the three Muxed Address
25 Buses (labeled A32-24, A23-13, and A12-A2 in Figure 12) are not necessary to perform the
26 multiplexing function.

27 **VI. MISCELLANEOUS DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS OF THE '336 PATENT**

28 The '336 patent's dual asynchronous clock innovation claims a ring oscillator clock on the

same chip as the CPU, which is timed such that temperature, voltage, process technology and manufacturing variations similarly affect the performance of both devices. Miscellaneous disputed claim terms speak to this clocking innovation:

A. “[including a plurality of electronic devices] correspondingly constructed of the same process technology with corresponding manufacturing variations” (Row 17) (‘336 patent, claim 1)

The pertinent portion of claim 1 of the '336 patent reads:

A microprocessor system, comprising a single integrated circuit including a central processing unit and an entire ring oscillator variable speed system clock in said single integrated circuit and connected to said central processing unit for clocking said central processing unit, said central processing unit and said ring oscillator variable speed system clock each *including a plurality of electronic devices correspondingly constructed of the same process technology with corresponding manufacturing variations*, a processing frequency capability of said central processing unit and a speed of said ring oscillator variable speed system clock varying together due to said manufacturing variations and due to at least operating voltage and temperature of said single integrated circuit; ...

‘336 Reexam Cert., 1:59-2:5 Mar Dec., Ex. H.

Plaintiffs' and TPL's constructions of the highlighted claim phrase follow:

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
<p>Correspondingly constructed by receiving the same semiconductor manufacturing processes with corresponding manufacturing variations</p>	<p>Constructed <i>using the same manufacturing process technology</i> with corresponding manufacturing variations</p>

TPL construes this term to require that the chip be constructed “using the same manufacturing process technology.” This refers to the CPU and the on-chip first clock being manufactured on the same substrate such that they are subjected to similar manufacturing variations, and, accordingly, their performance varies similarly.

“Process technology” was introduced during prosecution with an explanation “that operating characteristics of electronic devices in an integrated circuit will track one another depending on variations in the manufacturing process used to make the integrated circuit....” ‘336 Pros. Hist.; Mar. Decl., Ex. D at TPL0001917, 1919. The specification similarly provides that ring oscillator “performance tracks the parameters which similarly affect all other transistors on the same silicon die.” ‘336 patent at 16:65-67, Mar. Decl., Ex. B.

The applicant summarized the point to overcome the Magar prior art reference:

Crucial to the present invention is that *since both the oscillator or variable speed clock and driven device are on the same substrate, when the fabrication and environmental parameters vary, the oscillation or clock frequency and the frequency capability of the driven device will automatically vary together*. This differs from all cited references in that the oscillator or variable speed clock and the driven device are on the same substrate, and that the oscillator or variable speed clock varies in frequency but does not require manual or programmed inputs or external or extra components to do so.

7 ‘336 Pros. Hist.; Mar. Decl., Ex. E at TPL0001933 (emphasis added). See also *Id.*, Ex. C at
8 TPL0001904. Thus, “the process technology” of this claim term refers to the overall fabrication
9 parameters used on the single silicon substrate on which both the CPU and ring oscillator are
10 made. Plaintiffs’ construction would go much farther by importing the vague and uncertain
11 limitations of “receiving” and “semiconductor manufacturing processes,” neither of which is
12 illuminated by the intrinsic evidence. Defendants’ proposed construction should be adopted.

B. “clocking said central processing unit” (JCCS Row 20) (‘336 *passim*)

Plaintiffs' Construction	TPL's Construction
Driving said central processing unit without using any control input or any external clock, oscillator or crystal such that said central processing unit always executes, the maximum frequency, but never too fast	<i>timing the operation of the CPU</i>

19 The specification describes a ring oscillator variable speed system clock connected to the
20 CPU that times the operation of the CPU. TPL's construction follows Judge Ward's construction
21 for "oscillator . . . clocking," ("an oscillator that generates the signal(s) used for ***timing the***
22 ***operation of the CPU***") Ward Order at 13, and is consistent with the term's ordinary meaning.
23 Plaintiffs' own expert agrees. Wolfe Dep. 135:20-24; Mar Dec. Ex. V ("general ordinary
24 meaning would have been providing an oscillating signal that can be used as a timing reference
25 for the circuits in the central processing unit, basically providing a clock"). Plaintiffs' attempt to
26 narrow this term beyond its ordinary meaning is improper.

1 C. **“exchanging coupling control signals, addresses and data” (JCCS Row 18)**
 2 **(‘336 patent, Claims 6 and 10)**

3 This term relates to the interaction between the CPU and the integrated circuit’s input /
 4 output (I/O) interface. The claim requires:

5 an on-chip input/output interface connected to exchange coupling
 6 control signals, addresses and data with said central processing
 7 unit....

8 ‘336 patent Reexam Cert. 2:5-7; *see also*, Abstract; *see also*, 3:31-33; Mar Dec., Exs. H, B. The
 9 competing constructions:

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
Transmitting and receiving coupling control signals, addresses, and data	Transmitting and/or receiving coupling control signals, and addresses, and data

10 “Exchanging” contemplates that the CPU may transmit **and/or** receive the various types
 11 of signals. Plaintiffs’ contention to the contrary is not supported by the specifications, and would
 12 read out the embodiment depicted in Figure 6, where addresses go in only one direction from SH-
 13 BOOM to EPROM, and not in reverse. *See id.* at 8:30-32 (“Data lines 52 D9-D18 provide
 14 addresses to address terminals 264 of the EPROM 260.”). TPL’s construction, permitting some
 15 data types to be transmitted but not received, thus accords with the specification.

16 Plaintiffs’ construction is also ambiguous. It does not make clear whether all signals must
 17 be both transmitted and received, or at least one signal must be both transmitted and received, or
 18 at least one signal must be transmitted and at least one signal must be received. Plaintiffs’
 19 construction should be rejected.

20 D. **“as a function of parameter variation” (JCCS Row 21) (‘336 patent, claim 6)**

Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
in a determined functional relationship with parameter variation	Based on parameter variation

21 Claim 6 of the reissued ‘336 patent claims:

22 varying the processing frequency of said first plurality of electronic devices
 23 [comprising the CPU] and the clock rate of said second plurality of electronic
 24 devices [the oscillator clock] in the same way ***as a function of parameter***
 25 ***variation*** in one or more fabrication or operational parameters associated
 26 with said integrated circuit substrate . . .

1 ‘336 Reexam Cert., 2:22-28; Mar Dec., Ex. H (emphasis added). This term, read in context,
 2 means that as fabrication or operational parameters – such as voltage, temperature and process
 3 technology – vary, the CPU frequency and oscillator clock vary too.

4 Plaintiffs’ construction is too restrictive because it requires a “determined *functional*
 5 relationship.” This construction suggests the existence of an algebraic function to predict the
 6 CPU frequency and clock rate, even though no such mathematical relationship is disclosed in the
 7 specification. Plaintiffs’ construction is also confusing because, (a) it construes “function” by
 8 relying on the word “functional,” which is circular and unhelpful, and (b) it uses the phrase
 9 “functional relationship” which the PTO used in a completely different sense during prosecution.
 10 *See e.g.*, ‘336 Pros. Hist.; Mar Dec., Ex. C at TPL0001903 (specifying “functional relationship”
 11 as “ring oscillator variable speed system clock is disposed to clock the central processing unit”).
 12 Plaintiffs’ construction should be rejected.

13 **E. “external clock” (JCCS Row 24) (‘336 patent, claims 10, 13 and 16)**

14 Plaintiffs’ Construction	TPL’s Construction
15 A clock not on the central processing unit	A clock not on the integrated circuit substrate

16 TPL’s construction is based on Judge Ward’s claim construction order construing
 17 “external clock” as “a clock not on the integrated circuit substrate.” Ward Order, 16; Mar Dec.,
 18 Ex. A. TPL’s construction is also supported by the specification. The patents use the term
 19 “external” to denote off-chip devices:

20 The microprocessor 50, like any RISC type architecture, is optimized to
 21 handle as many operations as possible on-chip for maximum speed.

22 *External memory* operations take from 80 nsec. to 220 nsec. compared with
 23 *on-chip memory* speeds of from 4 nsec. to 30 nsec.

24 ‘336 patent, 27:16-20; Mar Dec., Ex. B. Here, “external” is the opposite of “on-chip.”¹⁹

25 ¹⁹ This is further supported by the usage of “external” in the claims. “External” is a spatial word,
 26 and the spatial frame of reference of the relevant claims is the integrated circuit substrate itself.
 27 Claims 10, 13 and 16 recite a device with a ring oscillator clock “disposed upon” the CPU
 28 integrated circuit substrate. They contemplate an “on chip input/output interface, an “off-chip
 external memory bus” and an “off-chip external clock.” As the spatial frame of reference of these
 claims is the integrated circuit substrate (i.e. the chip), “external clock” must refer to something
 outside of that spatial frame of reference, i.e. something off chip. Indeed, in prosecution, TPL

1 Plaintiffs' construction, "a clock not on the central processing unit," is flawed because a
 2 CPU is only a logical construct until it is created on an integrated circuit substrate. Therefore it is
 3 meaningless to suggest a clock circuit is "not on the CPU." A clock can be placed virtually
 4 anywhere on the physical surface of an integrated circuit substrate including within or outside the
 5 perimeter of the CPU logic. It is the connections that matter. Plaintiffs' expert agreed "I can't
 6 think of any reason right now why I would tie it to the CPU. I mean, that doesn't seem to match
 7 what's taught in the patent." Wolfe Dep. 102:10-16; Mar Dec., Ex. V. Defendants' construction
 8 is correct and should be adopted.

9 **VII. CONCLUSION**

10 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants request the Court enter an order adopting TPL's
 11 proposed claims constructions.

12 DATED: December 9, 2010

13 FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL LLP

14 By: /s/
 15 John L. Cooper

16 Attorney for Defendants
 17 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
 18 LIMITED, PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC
 19 CORPORATION, and ALLIACENSE
 20 LIMITED

21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28 introduced the term "'off chip' to clarify 'external'." '336 Reexam Hist.; Mar Dec. Ex. G at
 TPL0549462.